IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 51 of 1996

Between:

1. The Women's Cooperative Housing Society Ltd

with Head Office at Barkatpura,

rep. by its Secretary Smt. Radhabayamma.

2. Sri P.Srikant Reddy, S/o.Justice P.C.Reddy,

r/o.Banjarahilla, Road No.2, Owner of Plot Nos.98 and 99.

3. Smt. N.Nagamani, W/o.N.V.R.Seshagiri Rao,

r/o.Ramlote, Hyderabad, Owner of Plot No.83.

4. Smt. Shaila Natwa, W/o.Ashok Natwa,

rep. by GPA A.Venkata Ramana,

C/o.Plot No.93, Road No.5, Women's Coop. Housing Society,

Jubilee Hills, Owner of Plot No.94.

5. B.Avadamma, W/o.B.Subba Naidu,

rep. by B.S.Srinivasan GPA at Plot No.93,

Road No.5, Women's Coop. Housing Society,

Jubilee Hills, Owner of Plot No.103.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1. S.Yadaiah, S/o.S.Sayanna.

2. S.Shankaramma, W/o.S.Sayanna,

both residing at H.No.8-3-333,

Yellareddyguda, Hyderabad.

3. The District Collector, Hyderabad.

4. The Commissioner of Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ preferably in the nature of Mandamus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and declaring the action in entertaining the application in LCC No.268/95 and I.A. unnumber of 1995 is absolutely without jurisdiction and illegal and further direct the respondents not to interfere with the petitioners' construction on their plots with lawful permission.

Counsel for Petitioner No.2: MR. N.MOHAN KRISHNA

Counsel for Petitioners 1 & 3 to 5: None appeared

Counsel for Respondents 1 and 2: SMT.A.ANASUYA

Counsel for Respondent No.3: GOVERNMENT PLEADER FOR REVENUE

Counsel for Respondent No.4: STANDING COUNSEL FOR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF HYDERABAD

The Court made the following:

-

ORDER:

-

Sri N.Mohan Krishna, learned Counsel for the second petitioner submits that the writ petition has become infructuous. Placing the said submission on record, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

_____

R.SUBHASH REDDY, J

Dated: 06th December, 2004.

Ak

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Hyderabad.

2. The Commissioner, Municipal Coproration of Hyderabad,

Hyderabad.

3. Two CCs to the Government Pleader for Revenue, High Court

Buildings, Hyderabad (O.U.T).

4. Two CD copies.